DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 089 CS 014 003

TITLE	Learning To Teach Reading: Setting the Research Agenda. A Collection of Papers Presented at the Reading Research 2000 Conference. (Indianapolis, Indiana, April 29, 2000).
INSTITUTION	International Reading Association, Newark, DE.
PUB DATE	2000-04-29
NOTE	56p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Order Department, International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Road, P.O. Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714-8139. Web site: http://www.reading.org.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Proceedings (021) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Standards; Beginning Teachers; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Instructional Effectiveness; Knowledge Base for Teaching; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Research; Reading Teachers; *Teacher Education; Technology

ABSTRACT

This collection of abstracts is representative of the sessions presented at the International Reading Association's Reading Research 2000 Conference, held in Indianapolis, Indiana on April 29, 2000. The theme of the conference, "Learning To Teach Reading: Setting the Research Agenda," was a timely one as schools, teachers, states, teacher educators, and policymakers turn their attention to teacher preparation and professional development. Abstracts in the collection are: "Hundreds of Studies Have Shown...: Exaggerating Findings in the Advocacy for Particular Instructional Mandates" (Richard L. Allington); "Teacher Education and Issues of Diversity" (Kathryn H. Au); "Building Reading Expertise in Elementary Teachers" (Marsha R. Berger); "Developing Ownership of Professional Standards" (Jennifer Berne, Taffy Raphael, Barbara J. Diamond, and Susan Florio-Ruane); "Building a School Environment for Professional Development: The Case of Early Literacy" (Robert Calfee); "National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction: Findings, Implementation, and Recommendations. Features of Excellence" (Deborah Eldridge, Rachelle Loven, Joyce C. Fine, George P. Gonzalez, and Alene L. Smith); "National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction: Findings, Implementation, and Recommendations. Beginning Teacher Survey" (Amy Seely Flint, James V. Hoffman, Misty Sailors, and Marg Mast); "The Impact of Professional Standards" (Gary Galluzzo); "Preservice Reading Teacher Education: What's Going On? What Should Be?" (James V. Hoffman); "Using Multimedia Cases and Listservs in Preservice Literacy Education: Connecting What We Know About Good Teaching to Preservice Instruction Using Technology" (Charles Kinzer); "Social Reconstructionism and Agency in One Reading Teacher Education Program" (Rosary Lalik and Ann Potts); "The Status of the Knowledge Base" (P. David Pearson); "The Interface of Standards, Teacher Preparation and Research" (Dorothy S. Strickland); "The CIERA School Change Project: Translating Research on Effective Reading Instruction and School Reform into Practice" (Barbara M. Taylor); "Transitions into Teaching: A Longitudinal Study of Beginning Language Arts Teachers" (Sheila Valencia); and "Partnerships for Success in Teacher Education" (Carmelita K. Williams). Brief biographical sketches of presenters are attached. (RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 442 089

A COLLECTION OF PAPERS

PRESENTED AT THE

READING RESEARCH 2000 CONFERENCE

LEARNING TO TEACH READING: SETTING THE RESEARCH AGENDA

APRIL 29, 2000

INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

SPONSORED BY THE
INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION

800 Barksdale Road, PO Box 8139
Newark, Delaware 19714-8139, USA
www.reading.org

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J.M. Irwin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CS 014 003

Gail Keating, Projects Manager, Research
David Roberts, Association Editor
Iona Sauscermen, Production Manager

The International Reading Association attempts, through its publications, to provide a forum for a wide spectrum of opinions on reading. This policy permits divergent viewpoints without implying the endorsement of the Association.

Copyright 2000 by the International Reading Association, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, or any informational storage and retrieval system, without permission from the publisher.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction iii

Hundreds of Studies Have Shown . . .: Exaggerating Findings in the Advocacy for Particular Instructional Mandates 1
Richard L. Allington

Teacher Education and Issues of Diversity 6
Kathryn H. Au

Building Reading Expertise in Elementary Teachers 7
Marsha R. Berger

Developing Ownership of Professional Standards 8
Jennifer Berne, Taffy Raphael, Barbara J. Diamond, Susan Florio-Ruane

Building a School Environment for Professional Development: The Case of Early Literacy 10
Robert Calfee

National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction: Findings, Implementation, and Recommendations 13
Features of Excellence
Deborah Eldridge, Rachelle Loven, Joyce C. Fine, George P. Gonzalez
Alene L. Smith

National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction: Findings, Implementation, and Recommendations 16
Beginning Teacher Survey
Amy Seely Flint, James V. Hoffman, Misty Sailors, Marg Mast

The Impact of Professional Standards 18
Gary Galluzzo

Preservice Reading Teacher Education: What's Going On? What Should Be? 19
James V. Hoffman

Using Multimedia Cases and Listservs in Preservice Literacy Education: Connecting What We Know About Good Teaching to Preservice Instruction Using Technology 21
Charles Kinzer

Social Reconstructionism and Agency in One Reading Teacher Education Program 25
Rosary Lalik and Ann Potts

The Status of the Knowledge Base 29
P. David Pearson

The Interface of Standards, Teacher Preparation and Research 30
Dorothy S. Strickland

The CIERA School Change Project: Translating Research on Effective Reading Instruction and School Reform Into Practice 32
Barbara M. Taylor

Transitions Into Teaching: A Longitudinal Study of Beginning Language Arts Teachers 37
Sheila Valencia

Partnerships for Success in Teacher Education 40
Carmelita K. Williams

Closing Panel Discussion 41
Moderator: *Cathy Roller*
Panelists: *Kathryn Au, Gary Galluzzo, James V. Hoffman, P. David Pearson*

Biographies 42

INTRODUCTION

This collection of abstracts is representative of the sessions presented at the International Reading Association's Reading Research 2000 Conference, held in Indianapolis, Indiana, USA, on April 29th, 2000. We believe that they will be a helpful reference for those who wish to improve reading education. The Association is offering this set of papers in response to requests from conferees and as documentation of this important and stimulating research conference. In addition, the Association plans to produce a publication early next year focused on the topics discussed at this conference.

The theme of the conference, "Learning to Teach Reading: Setting the Research Agenda," is a timely one as schools, teachers, states, teacher educators, and policy makers turn their attention to teacher preparation and professional development.

In closing, thanks to all our presenters, to David Roberts, Association editor, and to Gail Keating, the Research and Policy Division's projects manager, for putting it all together.

Cathy M. Roller
Director of Research and Policy

PRESENTATIONS OF THE READING RESEARCH 2000 CONFERENCE

Hundreds of Studies Have Shown . . . : Exaggerating Research Findings in the Advocacy for Particular Instructional Mandates

RICHARD L. ALLINGTON
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA AND
THE CENTER FOR IMPROVEMENT OF EARLY READING ACHIEVEMENT

ABSTRACT

There is a buzz across the nation around the implementation of reform efforts funded under the Reading Excellence Act (REA). Much of the buzz stems from the REA requirement that funded reform efforts be based in scientific research. The non-regulatory guidelines for the REA (www.ed.gov/inits/FY99/REAguidance/sectionB.html) provide a number of criteria and a Q and A format that was, I suppose, designed to clarify, for local and state education agency personnel, just what would count as "scientific" evidence sufficient to warrant funding of a proposed reform initiative.

Several education groups or institutions have also produced a list of an odd mix of restructuring initiatives (e.g., Success for All), commercial curriculum materials (e.g. Open Court), professional development tools (Learning Styles Inventory), and instructional frameworks (e.g., direct instruction) that they suggest are "proven", or demonstrating some level of "scientific" evidence that supports claims for the efficacy of these products in improving student achievement — usually student reading achievement. These listings add to the buzz.

On reading the REA guidelines it seems that they do reliably expand on the legislative language and intent (although I could argue for different criteria in defining "scientific" studies). Having read the materials that accompany the lists of "proven" programs developed by several groups, I think it is time to take the legislative intent of the REA seriously. This would mean rejecting the claims that the available scientific evidence "proves" the worthiness of any of the several recommended instructional initiatives, programs, or frameworks.

A handful of serious research scientists have already argued the limitations of the "scientific evidence" that is purported to "prove" the efficacy of the three programs noted above. Though these critiques were not linked, specifically, to the REA guidelines, it is not difficult to do this. Dick Venezky has pointed out that Success for All (SFA) evidence was largely provided by the developers of that program and that the results achieved were very modest — students in SFA schools were roughly two and one-half years below grade level at the end of fifth grade — on an absolute scale (3.5 reading achievement level in SFA schools vs. 3.2 in Control schools at end of fifth grade). In addition, SFA is typically contrasted against Control schools where no alternative intervention was implemented, raising the specter of the "Hawthorne Effect" — the concern that any treatment gets better results than nothing because of the special attention heaped on intervention schools. Walberg and Greenberg, in an *Education Week* commentary, raised the issue of conflicts of interest in program evaluation in regards to SFA, noting that the few independent studies of SFA provide evaluations that are less positive than the evaluations provided by SFA developers.

Mike Pressley and I recently published a critique of the primary study used as "scientific evidence" for the Open Court (OC) materials (as has Denny Taylor in her book, *Beginning Reading and the Spin Doctors of Science* and Gerry Coles in his new book *Misreading Reading*). Our critique noted that some of the claims made by the authors of that study — recommendations for the use of systematic, sequential phonics instruction — cannot be supported because the design of the study did not isolate that instructional design component from the myriad of activities offered in OC curriculum. In addition, the results indicated a larger impact on emergent reading sub-processes than on children's reading achievement (reported comparative growth effects on phoneme awareness v. limited growth effects on reading fluency or text comprehension).

Stahl and his colleagues, in their *Reading Research Quarterly* review of the research on phonics instruction, note that the research on direct instruction is again largely authored by developers of direct instruction curriculum materials — the conflict of interest issue. Much of the direct instruction "research" is published in a "house" journal controlled by the developers. More is available in books and journals edited by the developers. However, as Stahl et al. noted, these papers often omit studies reporting less flattering findings. The evidence touted by proponents is often decades old, as is the controversy surrounding the adequacy of the data from the old Follow Through studies that are offered as the primary research evidence. And again, the evidence available on the effects of direct instruction on actual reading achievement and across time is modest, to say the least. That is, I know of no studies suggesting that a direct instruction intervention led to most children reading on grade level and remaining on level throughout the elementary grades. In fact, there seem to be no studies demonstrating the efficacy of direct instruction programs on sustaining children's general reading achievement or reading comprehension achievement in any large school system over any extended period of time (7-10 years).

None of the studies supporting any of the "proven" programs measured children's success in meeting the new thoughtful literacy standards now the target in most states. I would suggest

that, at a minimum, a "proven" program in this era of high-stakes testing should be able to demonstrate positive longitudinal effects on the thoughtful literacy assessments that states have implemented.

Getting serious about scientific research

I believe that the legislative intent behind REA was an attempt to more adequately ensure that federal education dollars were spent wisely — that is, that funds would be invested in reform initiatives that were well thought out and derived from the best evidence available.

Unfortunately, the best evidence available often fails to satisfy the REA guidelines. Indeed, I would argue that no reading instructional intervention actually meets the criteria set forth in the REA. In other words, the REA seems a bit too ambitious in the call for evidence and far too limited in its allocations to state and local education agencies for evaluating the impact of the programs that will be funded under REA.

This failure of the REA to provide guidance and adequate funding for rigorously evaluating federally funded education interventions is a horrendous mistake. But it follows a long-standing pattern in federal program guidelines — funding for interventions but with no coordinated and thorough evaluation strategy for learning from that funding. The millions of REA dollars could provide us with far more adequate evidence about the efficacy of a wide range of intervention efforts. But instead, it looks like the REA will simply provide a financial windfall to a handful of old and not very effective interventions (based on the best evidence now available).

Imagine the progress that might be made if REA (or the ESEA reauthorization) required state and local education agencies to set aside significant portions of the funding to document the impact of various interventions. I would even suggest that the REA guidelines might be simply turned inside-out to become guidelines for the evaluation studies that would be funded. For instance, REA (or ESEA or IDEA) evaluation monies could:

- Fund independent evaluations of the efforts — that is, remove the potential bias that results when developers research their own interventions.

- Ensure that different interventions were contrasted with each other rather than contrasted against the effects of achieved when Control schools continue the same old educational programs with no additional funds. This would address the Hawthorne Effect issue as well.

- Measure effects on real reading and writing performance rather than on some researcher-selected battery of sub-process assessment (e.g. phonemic segmentation, pseudo-word reading, word recognition in isolation, etc.). And maybe the evaluations could even attempt to evaluate the effects of the intervention on proclivity for reading and writing and acquisition of world knowledge.

- Insist on a common system for reporting effects against an absolute scale, perhaps performance on the NAEP tests against the NAEP proficiency levels. This would provide some evidence of the effectiveness of the funded efforts in helping students achieve the new standards (as opposed to the old minimum competency standards).

- Examine longer-term effects of interventions on students so we know whether observed effects are reliable over time.

- Provide useful information on the fidelity of implementation so that school districts might have a better sense of how difficult it is to implement the proposed intervention.

- Identify whether the intervention has an impact (positive, negative, or neutral) on the frequency of referrals to special education or retention in grade.

- Document the effect of different interventions on the development of teacher expertise. That is, do interventions result in teachers making better instructional decisions across time? Our own research on exemplary teachers suggests that more expert teachers can make any program, framework, or material work better than can typical teachers. We should be concerned about developing teacher expertise as "Job 1".

It seems to me that it is time to look the REA gift horse in the mouth. The current evidence on efficacy of any education program, framework, or material leaves much to be desired, as two recent reviews have made clear. Swanson and Hoskyn reviewed about 900 studies of interventions with students identified as learning disabled. Of that enormous number only 20 were considered rigorously designed so that high confidence might be placed in the results. Troia reviewed interventions focused on developing phonemic awareness in younger children and also found the majority of the studies failed to meet even half of the criteria established for rigor and few examined the longer-term impact of such development on learning to read. But a federal and state disinterest in funding high-quality studies is the primary culprit here.

The larger point is that finding a published article that supports any particular intervention is not as difficult as a finding several rigorously designed "scientific" articles (using the REA guidelines to define "scientific") that support the efficacy of that intervention.

We have learned a lot about the design of effective instruction and a bit about the design of effective programs, frameworks, and materials. But there is too much we do not know to pretend that there are a few "proven" programs and that federal monies should be largely devoted to funding those designs. We can create even more powerful interventions but, sadly, the REA (and perhaps ESEA like IDEA) was not crafted to improve the return on federal education dollars but, rather, to simply maintain the status quo. It is time to modify the REA budget, and I would argue, the budgets of all federal and state programs that support

educational interventions, so that rigorous evaluation studies will be funded and we can begin the work that would fulfill the legislative intent that undergirds the REA.

Congress seems appropriately concerned that federal dollars are invested in interventions for which there is reliable evidence that they enhance student achievement. But such evidence is sadly in short supply, and unless there is a substantial new investment supporting rigorous, scientific research on the impacts of REA funds, we will be no wiser for hundreds of millions of dollars the REA makes available.

We can settle for very modest improvements (at least some of the time with some of the students) in achievement by funding old programs with minimal "scientific" evidence of modest effects. Or we could take a different approach this time and set aside funds to create the initiative needed to develop far better understandings of what sort of interventions work for which children on what sort of learning over what period of time. Modest improvements are fine, I suppose, but to determine the nature of truly "excellent" instructional interventions will require a substantive investment in a different direction.

References

Allington, R. L. (1997, September). Whose claims are valid? *School Administrator*, 32-34.

Allington, R. L., & Woodside-Jiron, H. (1998). Decodable texts in beginning reading: Are mandates based on research?" *ERS Spectrum, 16*, 3-11.

Allington, R. L., & Woodside-Jiron, H. (1999). The politics of literacy teaching: How "research" shaped educational policy. *Educational Researcher*, November, 1-10.

Pressley, M., & Allington, R. L. (1999). What should educational research be the research of? Issues in education: Contributions from *Educational Psychology*, *5*(1), 1-35.

Swanson, H. L., & Hoskyn, M. (1998). Experimental intervention research on students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis of treatment outcomes. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(3), 277-321.

Taylor, D. (1998). *Beginning to read and the spin doctors of science: The political campaign to change America's mind about how children learn to read.* Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Troia, G. A. (1999). Phonological awareness intervention research: A critical review of the experimental methodology. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34*, 28-53.

Venezky, R. L. (1998). *An alternate perspective on Success For All.* In K. K. Wong (Ed.), *Advances in educational policy.* (Vol. 4, pp. 145-165). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Walberg, H., & Greenberg, R. (1998, April 8). The Diogenes effect. *Education Week*, pp. 60.

Teacher Education and Issues of Diversity

KATHRYN H. AU
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

ABSTRACT

Although the population of students in the U.S. is becoming more diverse, the population of teachers is becoming less diverse. This situation raises serious concerns for teacher education. This presentation will give an overview of issues and suggest possible ways of meeting the challenge, based on research conducted in Hawaii under the Ka Lama teacher education initiative. This initiative includes three components: an education academy, designed to help Hawaiian residents obtain associate degrees; a teacher education cohort, designed to prepare residents as elementary teachers; and a graduate studies cohort, designed to prepare residents for leadership roles in education. Studies conducted in conjunction with the initiative include historical research on the presence and absence of Hawaiian teachers in the public schools of Hawaii, case studies of students' progress through the teacher education cohort, and life history interviews of mentor teachers.

Building Reading Expertise in Elementary Teachers

MARSHA R. BERGER
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS

ABSTRACT

By whatever measure — academic success, financial stability, the ability to find satisfying work, personal autonomy, self-esteem — the child who doesn't learn to read well does not make it in life. Certainly, if we expect students to meet high academic standards, we must first teach them to become proficient readers. Recent scientific studies and the consensus around their findings have allowed us to understand more than ever before how literacy develops, why some children have difficulty, and what constitutes best instructional practice. Researchers and scientists now estimate that fully 95 percent of all children can be taught to read given the benefit of appropriate instruction; however, statistics reveal an alarming number of struggling and poor readers. And, while the population of students experiencing difficulty in learning to read is not limited to any one segment of our society, a disproportionate number of them are going to school in our major urban areas.

Research findings also indicate that, although some children will learn to read through deduction and opportunistic teaching, others will not learn to read unless they are taught in a systematic and explicit way by knowledgeable teachers using a range of research-based components and practices. Unfortunately, large numbers of teachers were never trained to deliver such instruction, nor have they had access to the current research consensus and related instructional applications.

The American Federation of Teachers has made teacher quality a high organizational priority. It believes that if teachers are to make informed decisions about the appropriate reading instruction for each student, they must have command of the content, and they must be aware of the most current valid research findings and the pedagogical implications of those findings. AFT, therefore, has several initiatives to help ensure that its members have the opportunity to become expert teachers of reading. This session describes those efforts.

Developing Ownership of Professional Standards

JENNIFER BERNE
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY AND OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE
TAFFY RAPHAEL
OAKLAND UNIVERSITY AND CENTER FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EARLY READING ACHIEVEMENT
BARBARA J. DIAMOND
EASTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY
SUSAN FLORIO-RUANE
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY AND CENTER FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EARLY READING ACHIEVEMENT

ABSTRACT

If standards are to be meaningful they must have resonance for practicing teachers. Our research study focuses on the ways in which published standards are or are not operationalized in classrooms. Our inquiry consisted of three phases. First, we identified primary sources for professional standards that are drawn upon in districts and schools in the United States. We gathered standards published by professional organizations such as the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English, as well as by government agencies such as the Michigan State Department of Education. This phase was completed as we synthesized standards across these documents into a list. The second phase involved teachers' individualized responses and priorities regarding the standards. We identified a subset of teachers representing suburban, urban and rural venues who have been working on curriculum and philosophy of teaching within the Teachers' Learning Collaborative, a professional network in the state of Michigan. In the third phase of data collection, the teachers met together in small groups to discuss their priority listings. Within this context, teachers created mini-cases, or narrative examples of the standards in action within their own classrooms. Using the mini-cases, they then reprioritized the standards to reflect the ways in which they are implemented, and their values to curriculum and instruction in language and literacy. In short, this process revealed how the words of standards documents intersect with the work of teaching.

Our preliminary analysis suggests that if teachers are able to use standards as a flexible tool, not merely receive them as a finished product, they become a powerful force for professional

development and dialogically-based learning. As they considered the role of standards in their daily work, these teachers turned a list of skills into a complex domain of knowledge and reminded us again of the depth and breadth of teachers' work. Considering standards as tools for independent innovations will make the need for support and resources even more crucial, yet the support takes on a different look when considered not as a set of criteria for teaching, but as a way to support reflection. This session focuses upon how teacher educators might best think about this use of standards.

Building a School Environment for Professional Development: The Case of Early Literacy

ROBERT CALFEE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

in association with
KIM NORMAN, MELANIE SPERLING
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

ABSTRACT

This report centers around a design experiment on reading instruction in the primary grades. We are employing WordWork as a platform for examining the results of various decisions confronting the teacher in adapting a metacognitive phonics curriculum to varying student needs (thanks for support from the Spencer Foundation). The point of the report is that the style of classroom-based inquiry embodied in the design experiment concept (a) demands substantial engagement of teachers as professionals, and (b) possesses the potential to enhance the professional quality of teachers, subject to contextual constraints.

What is a design experiment? The phrase springs from the work of Alan Collins, and from the more recent studies of Ann Brown and Joseph Campione. The goal is to combine the rigor of systematic experimentation with the realities of the classroom. Where does the researcher turn for guidance about methodology and procedure? Books on this topic have yet to emerge.

In our study we have construed the design experiment as collaborative inquiry centered around a conceptual framework designed to generate systematic data that (a) informs practice and (b) produces generalizable findings. A tall order, but perhaps a model for what "Schools of the Future" might and should be. This report is more about methodology than either interventions or results. Our conclusion is that the matter really comes down to the engineering challenge for those who want to investigate educational variations in today's schools and classrooms.

A few words about the WordWork platform. The program incorporates an explicit decoding-spelling curriculum, a variety of instructional strategies (whole-class, small-group, individual), and an integrated decoding-spelling approach that emphasizes metaphonics — students' need to comprehend the English orthographic system, as a foundation for fluency in both reading and writing. The platform builds on a large body of scholarship and empirical research, but at the level of practical application it leaves many decisions to the classroom teacher.

Our studies have focused on several design issues and procedures. Our focus has been on when and how to introduce various elements phonics elements (e.g., phonemic awareness, vowel contrasts), and how long to sustain these elements. Methods for assessing treatment implementation, teacher reactions and adaptations, and instrumentation (micro and macro) for student outcomes has proven an interesting challenge. The findings from the first two years can be sketched only briefly in the presentation: (a) "effects" for students have been very positive in absolute terms; (b) "effects" for teachers have varied widely, as have (c) "effects" for schools.

The latter two effects lead to reflections about the first two years that conclude the paper. One stance emphasizes the technical challenges of conducting a design experiment:

> Design strategies — (a) to what degree do the findings inform overall program effectiveness vs. program variations; (b) as we discover teachers departing from the design specifications, in what ways can we learn from the planned constancies vs. the naturally occurring adaptations; (c) what are the pros and cons of "staying the course" vs. "following the leads."
>
> Implementation hurdles — another perspective on the preceding issues emphasizes the difficulties of treatment fidelity; at times the metaphor seems akin to investigating surgical treatments on the battlefield.
>
> Instrumentation — in our studies, treatment variations occur in two-week-blocks. The challenge has been to incorporate "micro-assessments" to detect learning variations (students do learn something in these relatively short time periods) that track the variations while providing comparable "learning" trajectories.

A very different stance views the preceding topics as policy issues for teachers and schools: (a) collaboration quickly becomes interference, even when a new (and varying) program is designed to supplement or replace existing activities; (b) purposes and incentives associated with inquiry differ greatly for university researchers (even when directly interested in applied outcomes) and practitioners; and (c) outcomes have surprisingly little in common in many instances.

In concluding, we return to the title, to the concept of the school as an environment for

professional development, and the design experiment as a test case of this idea. Note that we are exploring neither "the teacher as researcher" nor program evaluation, but the possibility of systemic experimentation, evaluation, and transformation in collaboration with practitioners (both teachers and principals).

In most fields, professionals possess technical knowledge and bear an ethical responsibility. However, little in the preparation and induction of educators, the organization of schools, nor the various policy initiatives (standards, accountability) connect practitioners with either of these domains. Our conduct of these studies shows that (a) the daily life of classrooms and schools does provide fertile soil for systematic research toward fundamental enhancement of student learning, and (b) persistent pursuit of such inquiry, though difficult, carries the potential for development of a more professional stance and attitude — schools and teachers have been transformed in some instances. The long-term importance of this premise lies in the creation of institutions (classrooms, schools, and districts) that emphasize local inquiry, where evaluation and research of programs and procedures becomes commonplace, rather than uninformed reliance on "proven practice." The design experiment, more completely elaborated, may serve as a useful tool for approaching this difficult and demanding problem.

FEATURES OF EXCELLENCE

National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction: Findings, Implementations, and Recommendations

DEBORAH ELDRIDGE, GEORGE P. GONZALEZ, ALENE L. SMITH
HUNTER COLLEGE, NEW YORK
JOYCE C. FINE
FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
RACHELLE LOVEN
UNIVERSITY OF SIOUX FALLS, SOUTH DAKOTA

ABSTRACT

In January 1999 the Board of Directors of the International Reading Association charged the National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction (the Commission) with studying and making policy recommendations related to reading teacher education. At NRC 1999, the Commission presented an overview of the research and a progress report. This session will report findings from two studies and highlight upcoming activities.

The Commission is a three-year research effort devoted to the study of excellence in four-year undergraduate teacher preparation programs. The research is conducted at eight Commission sites: Florida International University (Miami, FL), Hunter College (New York NY), Indiana University (Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN), Norfolk State University (Norfolk, VA), University of Nevada, Reno (Reno, NV), University of Texas, Austin (Austin, TX), University of Texas, San Antonio (San Antonio, TX), and University of Sioux Falls (Sioux Falls, SD). There are three studies: the Features of Excellence Study, the Teacher Educator Survey, and the Beginning Teacher Study. These studies examine important relationships among teacher preparation programs, beginning teachers' reading instruction, and children's reading achievement. The body of research devoted to examining

these relationships is extremely limited (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998; National Reading Panel, in press).

FEATURES OF EXCELLENCE

Purpose. The Features of Excellence Study examines the common and the unique features of teacher education programs across the Commission sites. The purpose is to identify those program features that lead to excellence in beginning teachers' reading instruction.

Methodology This is primarily a qualitative study. Each program site prepared a draft document presenting the features of their programs that lead to excellence in beginning teachers reading instruction. Each site shared their draft with the other Commission sites, and the Commission agreed upon a common format for the site Features of Excellence documents. The Commission then examined the eight program documents and agreed upon nine features that lead to excellence. They prepared a short description of each feature, and then each site provided a description of the implementation of that feature in their teacher education program. Following this the Commission completed a final Features of Excellence Report that states and explains each feature and provides concrete examples of implementation.

RESULTS — THE NINE FEATURES OF EXCELLENCE:

- Our programs are based on clearly articulated institutional missions that reflect a sense of who we are and who we want to become.
- Our programs foster the professional identity of preservice teachers and teacher educators within and across a variety of communities.
- A crucial feature of our teacher education programs is faculty commitment.
- Our programs nurture responsiveness to diversity in many forms and at many levels.
- Based upon current research and professional standards, programs deliver broad-based content to best meet the needs of diverse students.
- Supervised field experiences are a critical feature of our teacher preparation programs.
- Our faculties strive to maintain the integrity and quality of the literacy program while working within the limited resources and constraints imposed by schools, the university and the state.
- Our programs are responsive to individual students' needs.
- A discriminating admissions/entry/exit continuum of procedures for academic accountability, both supportive of diverse candidates and aimed at producing quality reading teachers, insures that teachers are knowledgeable, have the necessary skills, and are able to teach reading effectively.

References

National Reading Panel. (in press). *The Report of the National Reading Panel.* Washington, DC: National Institute for Child Health and Development.

Snow, C.E., Burns, & M.S., Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Taylor, B.M., Pearson, P.D., Clark, K.F., & Walpole, S. (1999). *Beating the odds in teaching all children to read.* Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement.

BEGINNING TEACHER SURVEY

National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction: Findings, Implementations, and Recommendations

AMY SEELY FLINT
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
JAMES V. HOFFMAN, MISTY SAILORS, MARG MAST
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN

ABSTRACT

In January 1999 the Board of Directors of the International Reading Association charged the National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction (the Commission) with studying and making policy recommendations related to reading teacher education. At NRC 1999, the Commission presented an overview of the research and a progress report. This session will report findings from two studies and highlight upcoming activities.

The Commission is a three-year research effort devoted to the study of excellence in four-year undergraduate teacher preparation programs. The research is conducted at eight Commission sites: Florida International University (Miami, FL), Hunter College (New York NY), Indiana University (Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN), Norfolk State University (Norfolk, VA), University of Nevada, Reno (Reno, NV), University of Texas, Austin (Austin, TX), University of Texas, San Antonio (San Antonio, TX), and University of Sioux Falls (Sioux Falls, SD). There are three studies: the Features of Excellence Study, the Teacher Educator Survey, and the Beginning Teacher Study. These studies examine important relationships among teacher preparation programs, beginning teachers' reading instruction, and children's reading achievement. The body of research devoted to examining these relationships is extremely limited (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998; National Reading Panel, in press).

BEGINNING TEACHER STUDY

Purpose. The purpose of the Beginning Teacher study is to describe beginning teachers graduated from Commission programs and to compare them to beginning teachers from programs that do not emphasize reading instruction.

Methodology. The Beginning Teacher study follows graduates of the Commission site programs into and through their first two years of teaching. In year one, the beginning teachers and some comparison beginning teachers from other programs were interviewed at the beginning, middle, and end of the year. These interviews focused primarily on reading instruction and the beginning teachers' concerns and practices for teaching reading. In year two, program and comparison teachers will be interviewed twice and observed twice. Interviews will be similar to those conducted in year one. The observations will be based on a methodology developed by Taylor and her colleagues (Taylor, Pearson, Clark & Walpole, 1999).

Results. The content of analysis of the initial year's interviews, and the preliminary findings from the first observation will be presented.

References

National Reading Panel. (in press). *The Report of the National Reading Panel.* Washington, DC: National Institute for Child Health and Development.

Snow, C.E., Burns, & M.S., Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Taylor, B.M., Pearson, P.D., Clark, K.F., & Walpole, S. (1999). *Beating the odds in teaching all children to read.* Ann Arbor, MI: Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement.

The Impact of Professional Standards

GARY GALLUZZO
NATIONAL BOARD FOR PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS

ABSTRACT

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards achieved what many thought impossible. We developed and achieved consensus on a set of professional, advanced standards for the nation's pre-kindergarten through 12th grade teachers. And we put in place an innovative performance-based assessment process, National Board Certification, to measure a teacher's practice against those standards.

National Board Certification recognizes accomplished teachers not with measures of quantity — the number of degrees, years of experience, or specialized training courses — but with measures of quality based upon accepted standards.

The introduction of National Board Certification has also provoked a healthy reexamination of our education system's current incentive structures, professional development programs, hiring practices, teaching assignments, and teacher career paths. We are not only providing teachers with a new measure of professionalism and self-pride; we are rebuilding respect and support for the schools — by building respect and support for teachers.

The National Board envisions a revitalized system of American education in which our vision of accomplished teaching, as embodied in our standards, is integrated and accessible to all teachers throughout their professional lives, beginning with their pre-service preparation and continuing throughout their in-service years. Now it's time to integrate and infuse this idea throughout the system of teacher education and professional support.

Preservice Reading Teacher Education: What's Going On? What Should Be?

JAMES V. HOFFMAN
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN

ABSTRACT

In January 1999 the Board of Directors of the International Reading Association charged the National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction (the Commission) with studying and making policy recommendations related to reading teacher education. At NRC 1999, the Commission presented an overview of the research and a progress report. This session will report findings from two studies and highlight upcoming activities.

The Commission is a three-year research effort devoted to the study of excellence in four-year undergraduate teacher preparation programs. The research is conducted at eight Commission sites: Florida International University (Miami, FL), Hunter College (New York NY), Indiana University (Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN), Norfolk State University (Norfolk, VA), University of Nevada, Reno (Reno, NV), University of Texas, Austin (Austin, TX), University of Texas, San Antonio (San Antonio, TX), and University of Sioux Falls (Sioux Falls, SD). There are three studies: the Features of Excellence Study, the Teacher Educator Survey, and the Beginning Teacher Study. These studies examine important relationships among teacher preparation programs, beginning teachers' reading instruction, and children's reading achievement. The body of research devoted to examining these relationships is extremely limited (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998; National Reading Panel, in press).

TEACHER EDUCATOR SURVEY

Purpose. The purpose of the Teacher Educator Survey was to determine the importance teacher educators place on an array of program components and also to rate their particular programs for each of the components.

Methodology. The Commission identified a population of teacher educators in the area of elementary reading. They developed a survey that consisted of three sections: a demographic section which collected information about the participants, a values section which asked teacher educators to rate the importance of program features to producing excellent beginning reading teachers, and a section which asked teacher educators to rate their own programs on these same features.

Results. The analysis provides a view of existing programs in relation to critical features of varying importance levels. These data are viewed in relation to the findings of the Features of Excellence Study as well.

References

National Reading Panel. (in press). *The Report of the National Reading Panel.* Washington, DC: National Institute for Child Health and Development.

Snow, C.E., Burns, & M.S., Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Using Multimedia Cases and Listservs in Preservice Literacy Education: Connecting What We Know About Good Teaching to Preservice Instruction Using Technology

CHARLES KINZER
VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

In an effort to expand preservice students' reflection on practice as well as reflection on their own learning, multimedia case studies and communication technology are beginning to play an increasingly important role in preservice instruction. In part, this has resulted from an increased recognition that field experiences, reflection on practice, and group interaction around instructional issues are important for preservice teachers' learning. Specifically, multimedia cases on CD-ROM, and listserv technology, are allowing preservice students in literacy methods classes to analyze teachers' decisions, to make decisions of their own, to communicate with peers as well as more knowledgeable others, and to reflect on decisions and learning in ways not possible even five years ago.

Yet, while both print-based and multimedia cases are becoming more prevalent, important questions remain to be considered: What constitutes a case? What makes a case different from an example, and when is the use of a case and an example most appropriate? What are the various types of listservs, how are they best used, and when are the different types most appropriate? How might listservs and case-based instruction be merged to enhance preservice literacy education?

This session raises these and other questions through presenting a sample multimedia case and through the use of sample listserv communications that show the variance between various structures of listservs that have been used in preservice education classes.

Types of Cases, Types of Listservs: What's in a Case and How Might Discussion Forums Work?

Case studies have been successfully used in teaching the content areas of medicine, law and business for some time. More recently, case studies have become more widely accepted in preservice education, and an increasing number of written case study materials have become available for education classes. In particular, printed casebooks have proliferated, and interest in case-based methods appears to be growing. In part, this interest might be caused by a growing recognition of the value of interactive decision making and reflection on learning.

Converging with case-based instruction is the increasing availability, affordability and capability of technology in schools of education. As technology has become more widely available, and as its capability and potential have become better understood, case-based methods that use technological delivery systems are coming to the fore. Technology has allowed preservice instructors to set up listservs, electronic "bulletin boards" where questions can be posted, responses can be shared, and where all participants can read all postings.

Yet there are differences among multimedia cases and print-based cases, and differences among various structures of listservs. When one considers that cases consist of the raw data that learners use to construct and analyze decisions, then the delivery system for the data becomes salient. While print-based cases can describe (and thus "filter" what is described through the narrator's lens), multimedia cases under microcomputer control can show the case directly, thus allowing the learner a relatively unfiltered interaction with the substance of the case — the "data." Of course, no case can provide *all* of the contextual background and interactions that are part of a classroom, but multimedia cases come much closer to showing reality than do print-based cases, and this reality provides both the instructor and the learner with advantages in preservice instruction.

To the extent that a case has value it must be considered in terms of how it can facilitate and promote reflection and discussion, and this is true of listserv technology as well. When one considers that listservs can have various forms, then one must also examine how these forms optimize or constrain discussion. For example, listservs may include the instructor or may not, may require that students post a response every week or may not, may be a course requirement or be voluntary, may be based on a set issue every week or may allow students to generate issues as they wish.

The variations of listservs and of cases result in advantages and disadvantages for teaching and learning in preservice literacy classrooms. This session, presented as part of the Reading Research 2000, will explore these differences, present thoughts and preliminary findings on interactions in these various formats, and will encourage the audience to interact in providing their questions, thoughts, and expertise in an attempt to delineate the boundaries of the questions posed in the introduction to this summary.

References

Dodson, M. (December, 1999). *Monologic and dialogic conversations: How preservice teachers socially construct knowledge through oral and computer-mediated classroom discourse.* Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Orlando, FL.

Harrington, H., Quinn-Learing, S., & Hodson, L. (1996). Written case analysis and critical reflection. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12*(1), 25-37.

Kinzer, C.K., & Risko, V.J. (1998). Multimedia and Enhanced Learning: Transforming Preservice Education. In D. Reinking, M. McKenna, L. Labbo, & R. Kieffer (Eds.), *Handbook of technology and literacy: Transformations in a post-typographic world* (pp. 185-202). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Learned, E.P. (1987). Reflections of a case method teacher. In C.R. Christensen (Ed.), *Teaching and the case method* (pp. 9-15). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

Levin, J.A, Kim, H., & Rielm, M.M. (1990). Analyzing instructional interactions in electronic message networks. In L.M. Harasim (Ed.), *Online education: Perspectives on a new electronic environment* (pp. 185-213). New York: Praeger Press.

Lundeberg, M.A., Levin, B.B., & Harrington, H.L. (1999). *Who learns what from cases and how?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Merseth, K. (1991). *The case for cases in teacher education.* Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and American Association of Higher Education.

Richards, J.C., Moore, R.C., & Gipe, J.P. (February, 2000). *Teaching for multiple literacies in the 21st century: Preservice teachers' case quandaries in three different early field programs.* Paper presented at the NCTE Assembly for Research Midwinter Conference, Seattle, WA

Risko V.J., Yount, D., & McAllister, D. (1992). Preparing preservice teachers for remedial instruction: Teaching problem solving and use of content and pedagogical knowledge. In N. Padak, T.V. Rasinski, & J. Logan (Eds.), *Inquiries in literacy learning and instruction.* (pp. 179-189). Pittsburg, KS: College Reading Association.

Selfe, C.L., & Meyer, P. (1991). Testing claims for on-line conferences. *Written Communication, 8*, 163-192.

Shulman, J.H. (1992). *Case methods in teacher education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Shulman, L.S. (1995). Just in case: Reflections on learning from experience. In J.A. Colbert, P. Desberg, & K. Trimble (Eds.), *The case of education.* (pp. 197-217). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Silverman, R., & Welty, W.M. (1995). Teaching without a net: using cases in teacher education. In J.A. Colbert, P. Desberg, & K. Trimble (Eds.), *The case of education*. (pp. 159-171). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Social Reconstructionism and Agency in One Reading Teacher Education Program

ROSARY LALIK AND ANN POTTS
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY AND STATE UNIVERSITY

PURPOSE

In this study we examined whether and to what extent social reconstructionism is a viable framework for literacy teacher education at our university. This question had become salient for us in light of the ascendance of more conservative views of literacy education (Allington & Woodside-Jiron, 1999; Gee, 1999), evidence of which we observed in the narrowing of recent definitions of reading (Snow, Burns, & Griffin, 1998); state policy decisions promoting code emphasis instruction in beginning literacy, the explicit teaching of phonics, and reliance on "decodable texts" (Allington, 1999); and the expansion of the standards movement in education (Apple, 1998). Given these trends, we wondered whether, in the preparation of literacy teachers, it is a service to teachers or to the community to pursue notions of literacy that represent non-dominant agendas.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In the U.S. there has been a longstanding dispute about what purposes schools should serve (Mosenthal, 1999), and numerous competing positions have been developed and disseminated. One, in particular, social reconstructionism (Stanley, 1992), has used the concept of democracy as a fulcrum for educational theory and practice. It has been spurred by Dewey's (1944) argument that schools should prepare each new generation to participate as active members of a democratic society; Greene's (1988; 1995) description of the place of the language arts in any curriculum aimed toward democratic values; and Freire's (1970; 1973) pedagogy through which he expressed literacy as the ability to critique the contexts in which we live in terms of equity and justice and to change those circumstances that are unjust, beginning with changing ourselves (Shannon, 1990; 1992). The tradition has inspired teaching (Edelsky, 1999; Shor, 1992; Weiler, 1988) and has coalesced with the critical tradition in education (Stanley, 1992), currently addressing intersections of gender, race, class, and other categories of experience that fuel inequity in schooling and society

(Andersen & Collins, 1995; Delpit, 1995; Collins, 1991; 1998; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Hooks, 1990; 1994).

METHOD

To initiate study, we used an interview process to examine the views of four literacy education faculty and twelve preservice teachers. We asked faculty: What are the most important outcomes that you hope teachers will gain from your course? What role, if any, do social justice and societal transformation have in your effort at preparing literacy teachers? To what extent do you help beginning and/or experienced literacy teachers develop practices that support social justice and societal transformation? We asked preservice teachers to identify the major themes developed by their literacy education professor, whether and how each theme was related to teaching practices they learned, and what their personal views and intentions were concerning literacy teaching. Aware of our committed researcher perspective (Frankenberg, 1993), we read and reread transcribed interview data to determine themes that were reflected within and across various portions of the responses (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), drafted interpretations, and reexamined the data for confirming and disconfirming evidence (Erickson, 1986).

FINDINGS

Faculty members' views. Literacy teacher educators described strong commitment to developing relationships between social issues and school literacy practices, and they described numerous practices they believed were relevant, well taught, and appreciated by preservice teachers. Societal transformation as a goal of literacy learning was more acceptable to some faculty than others. All faculty reported experiencing the current developments at the state and national levels as professionally disappointing and especially oppressive to children from non-dominant groups, such as African-American children and economically impoverished children.

Preservice teachers' views. Preservice teachers were somewhat equivocal about critical pedagogy. Several expressed the perspective from social Darwinism that hard work was the overriding influence in achieving success in school and elsewhere. All saw school as the place where students must learn whatever knowledge and skill is included on state and national tests. Some expressed the view that though necessary for continuance as a literacy teacher, such a goal is insufficient, arguing for the importance of developing such additional ends as positive self-esteem, good work ethic, appreciation and respect for others, and active community participation. Preservice teachers did not readily identify connections between issues of social justice and literacy learning or between such issues and classroom practices. Nevertheless, all could identify many practices that they were learning and that they wished to use in the future. Among these were several that their professors had associated with social justice and societal transformation.

SIGNIFICANCE

Findings from this study suggest that social reconstructionism continues to be used as a framework in the preparation of literacy teachers at this university. Literacy teacher educators with whom we spoke were adamant about incorporating views from social reconstructionism

(Stanley, 1992), Critical Theory (Delpit, 1995), and/or New Literacy Studies (Street, 1995) in their teaching. They were not dissuaded by the current demands from state and national reforms, though they recognized that their stance was not without professional risk. Nevertheless it remains unclear whether this teaching is sufficient to help pre-teachers appreciate and understand the critical perspective or to conduct commensurate classroom practice.

References

Allington, R. (1999). Critical issues: Crafting state educational policy: The slippery role of research and researchers. *Journal of Literacy Research, 31*(4), 457-482.

Allington, R., & Woodside-Jiron, H. (1999). The politics of literacy teaching: How "research" shaped educational policy. *Educational Researcher, 28*(8), 4-13.

Andersen, M. & Collins, P. (1995). *Race, class, and gender: An anthology*. New York: Wadsworth.

Apple, M. (1998). Are markets and standards democratic? *Educational Researcher, 27*(6), 24-28.

Collins, P. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge consciousness and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Collins, P. (1998). *Fighting words: Black women and the search for justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children*. New York: The New Press.

Dewey, J. (1944). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Edelsky, C. (1999). *Making justice our project: Teachers working toward critical whole language practice*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Erickson, F. (1986).Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (3 ed.) (pp. 119-161). New York: Macmillan.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury.

Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Seabury.

Gee, (1999). Critical issues: Reading and the new literacy studies: Reframing the National Academy of Sciences report on reading. *Journal of Literacy Research, 31*(3), 355-374.

Glaser & Strauss (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine.

Greene, M. (1988). *Dialectic of freedom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hooks, B. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *Dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mosenthal, P. (1999). Critical issues: Forging conceptual unum in the literacy field of pluribus: An agenda–analytic perspective. *Journal of Literacy Research, 3*(2), 213-254.

Shannon, P. (1990). *The struggle to continue: Progressive reading instruction in the United States*. Portsmouth, NH Heinemann.

Shannon, P. (1992). *Becoming political: Readings and writings in the politics of literacy education*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Snow, C., Burns, S., & Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Stanley, W.B. (1992) *Curriculum for Utopia: Social reconstructivism and critical pedagogy in the postmodern era*. Albany, New York: State University Press.

Street, B. (1995). *Social literacies: Critical approaches to literacy in development, ethnography and education*. New York: Longman.

Weiler, K. (1988). *Women teaching for change: Gender, class & power*. New York: Bergin & Garvey.

The Status of the Knowledge Base

P. DAVID PEARSON
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
THE CENTER FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EARLY READING ACHIEVEMENT

ABSTRACT

In this presentation, Professor Pearson examines critically several current attempts to specify the knowledge base required for teaching reading, especially the knowledge base needed for novice teachers. Recognizing that we lack any substantive research base for determining what this knowledge base ought to be, he offers a set of criteria for specifying a provisional knowledge base that we can use until such time as we can evaluate more directly the link between teacher knowledge and student learning. He closes with a framework for organizing that provisional knowledge base and a few suggestions for essential research studies that the field must carry out in the next few years in order to bolster our understanding of that critical link between teacher knowledge and student learning.

The Interface of Standards, Teacher Preparation and Research

DOROTHY S. STRICKLAND
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

Both recent and past reform efforts indicate that teacher quality is the crucial factor in children's reading/literacy achievement.

- Teacher preparation has come to the forefront as a crucial element in education reform.
- The current demand for large numbers of qualified teachers, particularly in urban areas, will continue to increase in the coming years.
- The need for all teachers to be well trained in the areas in which they teach has received widespread attention.
- Virtually every state has produced standards that set high expectations for literacy achievement by the end of fourth grade.
- Many teachers at the primary grade levels are inadequately prepared to teach literacy.
- Teachers and caregivers at pre-first grade levels are apt to have no training in early literacy.

There is a need for a national and international agenda in the areas of teacher preparation and ongoing professional development for teachers of reading/language arts. The agenda would include:

(1) Clear and focused guidelines for the content and clinical experiences of preservice and inservice teachers at three levels of professional development — initial preservice, the induction period, and ongoing professional development;
(2) A research agenda to select promising lines of inquiry to improve existing programs and develop exemplary models.

References

Learning to read and write: Developmentally appropriate practices for young children. (1998). Newark, DE: International Reading Association and The National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Snow, C., Burns, S., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.

Strickland, D.S. (1995). Pre-elementary programs: A model for professional development. In S. Wepner, J. Feeley, and D. Strickland (Eds.), *The administration and supervision of reading programs*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Zeichner, K. (December, 1999). The new scholarship in teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 4-15.

The CIERA School Change Project: Translating Research on Effective Reading Instruction and School Reform Into Practice

BARBARA M. TAYLOR
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
CENTER FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EARLY READING ACHIEVEMENT

THE CIERA SCHOOL CHANGE PROJECT (YEAR 1): TRANSLATING RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE READING INSTRUCTION AND SCHOOL REFORM INTO PRACTICE IN HIGH-POVERTY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Barbara M.Taylor, University of Minnesota and CIERA
P. David Pearson, Michigan State University and CIERA
Virginia Richardson, University of Minnesota and CIERA

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The overall objective of this project is to test the efficacy of a school-reform-in-reading framework designed to be used by elementary schools to build a local reading program that will improve students' reading achievement. We know a great deal about practices that promote reading success in the elementary grades. We also possess a great deal of knowledge about school change and the role of professional development in the change process. However, one frustration has been our apparent inability to put the knowledge we possess to work. Even though we continue to learn more about effective schools, effective instruction, and effective change efforts, we seem hard pressed to integrate and apply this knowledge in ways that impact the thousands of schools that are struggling to teach all children to read. These premises lead us to two fundamental questions:

1. Will a research-based, action-oriented, internet-delivered framework designed to promote grass roots reading program reform — based upon our best knowledge about six components (classroom practice, school reading programs, reading interventions, school-home-community relations, school change processes, and professional

development) — produce robust changes in (a) school-wide approaches to delivering reading instruction, (b) classroom teaching practices, and (c) student learning and reading achievement?

2. What practices across schools pertaining to the six key program components are most effective in promoting changes in the teaching of reading and in students' reading achievement?

PERSPECTIVES OF THE STUDY

In trying to answer these questions, we do NOT think that we can or should randomly assign programs or even particular programmatic components to schools and teachers; to do so would violate what we have learned from the last 20 years of research on school change. However, it is neither necessary nor desirable to invite each and every school to "rediscover the wheel." Therefore, what we have done is to offer school staffs a framework for making their own decisions about how they might create a reading program. The framework consists of a set of six components, each of which must be addressed in building a reading program. For each component, the framework provides the best available research-based knowledge to guide schools in crafting their local implementation of that component. The framework exists as an Internet-based multimedia program with research summaries, readings, video clips of effective practice, and learning activities to guide local action. Within each component, the research permits some choices in the way it is implemented. We expect enough natural variation in the way each component is addressed to permit some experimental comparisons of the efficacy of various choices.

METHOD

Participants. Seven schools are participating in the CIERA School Change Project in 1999-2002. These schools are in Roxboro, NC; Southfield, MI; Madison, WI; Minneapolis/St. Paul, MN; and Los Angeles, CA. At least 70% of the teachers in a building agreed to participate in the project. Two teachers per grade from among those participating in the study were randomly selected for classroom observations. Within these classrooms, 12 children were selected as target students, four each from the high, middle, and low thirds of the classroom continua of reading achievement (with the hope, given what we know about attrition, of yielding nine by May). As many of these same children as possible will be followed for the years that the project is occurring in their building.

Use of the school change framework. Schools are meeting for a minimum of one hour a month as a large group and one hour a week in small groups. A school leadership team made up of teachers, the principal, and an external facilitator (who is spending a minimum of eight hours a week in the building) is leading the staff through the school change framework and activities, with large and small group meetings focusing on the six major areas: school change, ongoing professional development, school reading program, classroom instruction, early reading interventions, and home-school-community connections. Large group activities include discussion and action on the school-wide reading program as well as issues related to school change and professional development, reports from study groups, and cross grade dialogue. Small group activities include the watching and discussing video clips of effective

practice, study groups, video sharing of one's own practice, problem solving, peer coaching, and cross grade dialogue.

Student assessments. The children randomly selected for participation are being assessed in the fall and spring on a number of literacy assessments (depending on grade level) including a standardized reading test (grade 1-6); letter names and sounds (K-1); phonemic awareness (K-1); sentence dictation (K-1); concepts of print (K-1); word-reading level (from an informal reading inventory), fluency (words correct per minute), and comprehension (retelling and questions) at word-reading level (grade 1-3); writing ability based on a prompt (1-6); and the reading of grade-level passages for the purpose of answering questions (grade 4-6).

Documenting classroom practice and program characteristics. On three occasions (fall, winter, spring) each participating teacher is being observed for an hour during reading instruction to document her classroom practices in the teaching of reading. The observers are taking detailed field notes to capture teacher and student talk and activity. At the end of each 5-minute note taking period, the observer scans the room to record the number of children productively engaged. At the end of the observation, the observer writes a summary which addresses these features of the classroom ecology: the general instructional approach used in the classroom; instructional sequences observed, approaches to word recognition, vocabulary and comprehension instruction; curriculum materials used; teacher's style of interacting with the children; teachers' allocation of time to different groups; grouping practices, student engagement; classroom management; and climate. Teachers are also keeping a log of activities covered and grouping practices for an entire week in the middle of the school year. Teachers and principals are being interviewed to document program features and participants' beliefs.

Results

Data from the interviews and field notes taken by our observers during school events will be used to describe the change process and complement the data from small and large group meeting notes and action plans. The data from classroom observations and teacher activity logs will be analyzed to determine how closely teachers in our experimental schools match the benchmarks obtained from the study of effective schools and accomplished teachers (Taylor, Pearson, Clark, & Walpole, 1999), how practices change over time as a function of participation in the study, and how changes in program features and instructional practices are related to changes in student performance. Our earlier work (Taylor, et al, 1999) suggests that several exemplary features of instruction (student engagement, time students spend in small versus whole group instruction, time for independent reading, approaches to word recognition and comprehension instruction, and teacher interaction styles) and schoolwide programs (strong links to parents, regular assessment of pupil progress, and strong professional collaboration) are associated with greater than expected student achievement.

At the IRA Reading Research 2000 meeting, preliminary data from the first year of the study will be reported. We will report on the relationships among professional development activities, program features, classroom practices, and student achievement.

Importance of the Study

Currently, the improvement of our children's reading achievement is a major national goal. Schools know that a wealth of information exists to help them move toward this goal, but access to all of the most relevant information in a format that helps schools take action remains elusive. We believe that a strategy that includes the best research available on reading pedagogy and school change within the framework of teacher involvement and ownership over the change process stands the very best chance of creating the knowledge that will help us achieve this goal. The Internet-based delivery system will make the framework widely and readily available to educators who want to improve their local schools. The Internet site will feature forums in which current users can share insights with one another and with those who are contemplating adoption of the framework.

References

Adams, M.J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Donoghue, P.L, Voelkl, K.C., Campbell, J.R., & Mazzeo, J. (1999). *NAEP 1998 reading report card for the nation*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Eastwood, K., & Louis, K.S. (1996). Restructuring that lasts: Managing the performance dip. *School Leadership, 2*, 212-225.

Epstein, J.L, Coates, L., Salinas, K., Sanders, M., & Simon, B. (1997). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fullen, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. Bristol, PA: Falmer.

Hiebert, E.H., & Taylor, B.M. (in press). Beginning reading instruction: Research on early interventions. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson. (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, volume III. New York: Longman.

Hoffman, J.V. (1991). Teacher and school effects in learning to read. In R. Barr, M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, & P.D. Pearson. (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research*, volume II. New York: Longman.

Joyce, B., & Calhoun, E. (1996). School renewal: An inquiry, not a prescription. In B. Joyce & E. Calhoun, (Eds.), *Learning experiences in school renewal: An exploration of 5 successful programs*. Eugene, OR: ERIC.

Knapp, M.S. (1995). *Teaching for meaning in high-poverty classrooms*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African-American children.* San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Liberman, A., Saxl, E.R., & Miles, M.P. (1988). Teacher leadership: Ideology and practice. In A. Liberman (Ed.), *Building a professional culture in schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Louis, K.S., Kruse, S., & Raywid, M., (1996). Putting teachers at the center of reform: Learning schools and professional communities. *NASSP Bulletin, 80* (580), 9-21.

Pressley, M. (1998). *Reading instruction that works: The case for balanced teaching.* New York: Guilford.

Puma, M.J., Karweit, N., Price, C., Riccuiti, A., Thompson, W., & Vaden-Kiernan, M. (1997). *Prospects: Final report on student outcomes.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Services.

Richardson, V., & Placier, P. (in press). Teacher change. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching.* (Fourth Edition). Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association.

Snow, C., Burns, S., & Griffin, P. (1998). *Preventing reading difficulties in young children: Report of the Committee on the Prevention of Reading Difficulties in Young Children.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy.

Taylor, B.M., Pearson, P.D., Clark, K., & Walpole, S. (1999). *Beating the odds in teaching all children to read: Lessons from effective schools and exemplary teachers.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Michigan: Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement.

Wharton-MacDonald, R., Pressley, M., & Hampston, J.M. (1998). Literacy instruction in nine first grade classrooms: Teacher characteristics and student achievement. *Elementary School Journal, 99,* 101-128.

Transitions Into Teaching: A Longitudinal Study of Beginning Language Arts Teachers

SHEILA VALENCIA
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

ABSTRACT

This longitudinal study is driven by our need to understand more deeply the relationship between preservice teacher education and teachers' developing understanding and practice of teaching reading. Many studies of teacher education suggest that teacher education programs have limited value to teachers and have little effect on their practices. Others suggest that any effects that might be there are washed out once teachers hit the "real word" of schools, classrooms, and kids (e.g., Kennedy, 1998; Ritchie & Wilson, 1993; Zeichner & Tabachnik, 1981. Our study attempts to ask more nuanced questions regarding how the contexts in which teachers learn and work shape their practices.

Using sociocultural theory as a theoretical framework (Cole, 1996; Engestrom, 1999; Grossman, Smagornisky, & Valencia, in press; Wertsch, 1981), we focused on how beginning teachers develop goals, identify problems they must solve, and choose a set of tools to inform and conduct their teaching. We looked at both the individual's experience, as well as at how settings are structured in order to understand teachers' development to address the following questions:

- What ideas, concepts, strategies and specific tools for teaching reading do preservice teachers take away from teacher education?
- How do their experiences in teacher education and their early experiences in schools shape their understanding and uses of these ideas and tools?
- How do beginning teachers modify what they have learned and continue to develop their understandings and practices of teaching reading over the first few years of teaching?

We followed 10 beginning teachers from their last year of preservice education into their first two years of full time teaching. Our data consist of individual and group interviews, classroom observations, and documents. We interviewed each teacher individually on at least 11 occasions and observed them a minimum of 5 times during each of the 3 years of the study. We also interviewed and observed the university supervisor and cooperating teacher as they worked with the student teacher, and, in the first two years of teaching, we interviewed participants' principals and mentor teachers.

Our analysis suggests that teachers did draw on pedagogical tools introduced during teacher education to develop their classroom reading practice. Specifically, conceptual tools that were buttressed with range of practical strategies were most influential. This combination provided teachers with a framework for thinking and the potential for instructional flexibility. We also found that the settings in which teachers taught, including their relationships with cooperating teachers and colleagues and the kinds of curriculum materials available, shaped teachers' developing understanding and practice. It is not clear however, that congruence between student teaching placement and course work is necessary for beginning teachers to learn; rather it seems that some degree of incongruity may, in fact, promote teacher learning. It is clear, however, that there must be opportunities for new teachers to manipulate, reflect on, and experiment with new ideas in their first few years.

Finally, conceptual and practical tools developed during teacher education seemed to "go underground" for some teachers as they navigated the challenges of beginning teaching However, during the teachers' second year, many of these tools resurfaced, as teachers tried to approximate their vision of good language arts instruction. The results of this study suggest the danger of making claims about what teachers do and do not learn during teacher education based only on data from their first year of teaching or from self-reports.

References

Cole, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Engstrom, Y. (1999). Activity theory and individual and social transformation. In Y. Engstrom, R. Miettinen, R. Punamaki (Eds.), *Perspectives on activity theory* (pp. 19-38). New York Cambridge University Press.

Grossman, P.L., Smagornisky, P., & Valencia, S.W. (in press). Appropriating tools for teaching English: A theoretical framework for research on learning to teach. *American Journal of Education*.

Kennedy, M.M. (1998). *Learning to teach writing: Does teacher education make a difference?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Ritchie, J., & Wilson, D. (1993). Dual apprenticeships: Subverting and supporting critical teaching. *English Education, 25*(2), 67-83.

Wertsch, J.V. (1981). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Zeichner, K.M. & Tabachnik, B.R. (1981). Are the effects of teacher education "washed out" by school experience? *Journal of Teacher Education, 32*(3), 7-11.

Partnerships for Success in Teacher Education

CARMELITA K. WILLIAMS
NORFOLK STATE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

Many organizations are looking at what teachers should know and be able to do and have established standards that would assist in making this a feasible measure of assessment for teacher education programs. The professional standards form a basis for curriculum development and practical experiences for preservice teachers and inservice staff development. These standards will be discussed as a measure of assessment for achieving excellence in teacher preparation programs.

Closing Panel Discussion

CATHY M. ROLLER, MODERATOR
INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION

PANELISTS
KATHRYN AU, UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
GARY GALLUZZO, NATIONAL BOARD OF PROFESSIONAL TEACHING STANDARDS
JAMES V. HOFFMAN, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, AUSTIN
P. DAVID PEARSON, MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

During this session, moderated by Cathy Roller, panelists will discuss policy and current issues that focus on teacher quality, professional development, and standards.

Questions from the audience and comments about today's sessions are encouraged to promote discussion and clarification.

CONFERENCE PRESENTERS

Richard L. Allington is the Irvin and Rose Fien Professor of Elementary and Special Education at the University of Florida. He is a research scientist with the National Research Center on English Learning and Achievement (CELA) and codirects two large-scale projects, one studying educational policymaking in four states and another studying exemplary integrated classroom literacy instruction in schools serving large numbers of poor children. Dick has been a member of the IRA Board of Directors and President of the National Reading Conference. He was co-recipient of the Albert J. Harris Award from IRA in recognition of his work contributing to the understanding of reading and learning disabilities, a recipient of the Outstanding Reading Educator Award from the New York State Reading Association, and has been named to the IRA Reading Hall of Fame. Dick currently serves on the editorial boards of *Reading Research Quarterly*, *The Reading Teacher*, *Remedial and Special Education*, the *Journal of Literacy Research*, and the *Elementary School Journal*. He has previously served terms on the editorial boards of the *Review of Educational Research* and the *Journal of Educational Psychology*, and as associate editor of the *Journal of Literacy Research*. He is an author of over 100 research articles and several books, including *Classrooms That Work: They Can All Read and Write* and *Schools That Work: All Children Readers and Writers* (Longmans) both co-authored with Pat Cunningham, *No Quick Fix: Rethinking Reading Programs in American Elementary Schools* (Teachers College Press/IRA) with Sean Walmsley, and *Teaching Struggling Readers* a collection of articles from *The Reading Teacher* and published by IRA. His forthcoming book, *What Really Matters for Struggling Readers* (Longmans), will be available this summer.
< dickaufl@aol.com >

Kathryn H. Au is a professor of teacher education and curriculum studies at the College of Education, University of Hawaii, Honolulu. She is also a member of the Board of Directors of the International Reading Association and will serve on this board until 2001. Since 1995 Au has taught literacy courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels at the University of Hawaii. She also has been active in coordinating an elementary teacher education group for the Leeward Coast of Oahu, supervising the field experiences of these students, conducting research in the classroom with Native Hawaiian children, advising graduate students, and consulting in public schools. Between 1980 and 1995 she was responsible for overall development of the Kamehameha Elementary Education Program language arts curriculum and developed a literacy curriculum and portfolio assessment system. She is the author of *Literature-Based Instruction: Reshaping the Curriculum* and *Balanced Literacy Instruction: A Teacher's Resource Book*, both published by Christopher-Gordon. She is also the author of *Literacy Instruction for Today* (HarperCollins), *Literacy Instruction in Multicultural Settings* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers), *Reading Instruction for Today* (Scott, Foresman) and *Culture and the Bilingual Classroom: Studies in Classroom Ethnography*, (Newbury House) < kathryna@hawaii.edu >

Marsha R. Berger is the deputy director of the Educational Issues Department of the American Federation of Teachers in Washington, D.C. She serves as the coordinator of the AFT's reading initiative which has, among other things, produced two publications: *Teaching Reading IS Rocket Science: What Expert Teachers of Reading Should Know and Be Able To Do*, and *Putting Reading Front and Center: A Resource Guide for Union Advocacy*. She has also worked closely with the organizations of the Learning First Alliance, which has helped to put the issue of improving reading performance on the table for discussion across the country. Her other responsibilities at the AFT include serving as codirector of the Educational Research & Dissemination (ER&D) Program, which is the AFT's professional development program, and working with local unions and their district partners in redesigning low-performing schools. In these roles she has developed training materials to support teachers' understanding and implementation of effective reading instruction, standards-based instruction at the school level, and cognitive science research findings. Prior to coming to the AFT, she was an elementary school teacher in Providence, Rhode Island, for 28 years, teaching the full range of students from Grades 2-5 and from Title I-eligible to gifted/talented. < mberger@aft.org >

Jennifer Berne is a faculty member in composition and chair of the English Department at Oakland Community College in Farmington Hills, Michigan. As part of her work as an advanced graduate student at Michigan State University, she is a research assistant for CIERA, working on a project to study teacher learning in professional development networks within and across schools and districts. Her research interests include inservice teacher learning, the effects of teaching standards on classroom practice, and the ways student literacy learning intersects with teacher learning. She is coauthor of a basic writing text, *Process of Discovery*, and a chapter in the recent edition of *Review of Educational Research*. < bernejen@pilot.msu.edu >

Robert Calfee is a cognitive psychologist with research interests in the effect of schooling on the intellectual potential of individuals and groups. He earned his degrees at UCLA, did postgraduate work at Stanford, and spent five years in psychology at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. In 1969 he returned to Stanford University to join the School of Education, where he served as a professor in the Committee on Language, Literacy, and Culture, and the Committee on Psychological Studies until 1998. He is presently a professor and Dean of the School of Education at the University of California, Riverside. His interests have evolved over the past three decades from a focus on assessment of beginning literacy skills to a concern with the broader reach of the school as a literate environment. His theoretical efforts are directed toward the nature of human thought processes, and the influence of language and literacy in the development of problem-solving and communication. His research activities include *Project READ*, *The Inquiring School*, the *Text Analysis Project*, and *Methods for Alternative Assessment*. These projects all combine theoretical and practical facets directed toward understanding and facilitating school change. He has also written critical papers in recent years on the effects of testing and educational indicators, ability grouping, teacher assessment, and the psychology of reading. He has served as editor of *Journal of Educational Psychology* and *Educational Assessment*, and has been a member of several boards and committees, including the California Commission for

the Establishment of Academic Standards, the National Research Council Committee on Test Equivalency, and the Board of Trustees for the Palo Alto Unified School District. < robert.calfee@ucr.edu >

Barbara J. Diamond is a professor in the Department of Teacher Education at Eastern Michigan University. She currently teaches courses in Elementary Reading/Language Arts in Urban Settings and Multicultural Literacy. She has coauthored a book on Multicultural Literacy and has published several book chapters and articles on literacy with diverse populations. Her current research focuses on preservice teachers and literacy learning in urban Comer schools. She has been an active and contributing member of NRC and IRA. She has also served on the MELAF (Michigan English/Language Arts Frameworks) Committee that published standards for Michigan teachers and teacher educators. < BJDIAM@aol.com >

Deborah Eldridge is an assistant professor of reading, language arts and literacy at Hunter College. She also serves as a commissioner on the National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction, a three-year study supported by the International Reading Association. Eldridge received her Bachelor of Science degree, Magna Cum Laude, in human development from the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. After serving as a teacher trainer and education coordinator for the Peace Corps in Columbia, South Carolina, she obtained her master's degree in foreign language education with a specialization in bilingual education from the University of Texas in Austin. She has taught elementary school grades one through four in both public and private sectors in Texas and Massachusetts. While a doctoral fellow at Boston University, she was a literacy tutor and assistant director of the Intergenerational Literacy Project collaboration with Chelsea Public Schools. After receiving her doctorate in language, literacy and cultural studies, she served as a faculty member in reading and literacy for both Boston University and University of Maryland's professional development programs overseas, for the United State International University in Dothan, Alabama. Her book, entitled *Teacher Talk: Multicultural Lesson Plans for the Elementary Classroom*, was published by Allyn and Bacon in 1998. < deborah.eldridge@hunter.cuny.edu >

Joyce C. Fine is an associate professor in the Department of Elementary Education at Florida International University. She also serves as a commissioner on the National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction, a three-year study supported by the International Reading Association. A former classroom teacher and reading consultant, she has established and taught in a professional development school and the Community Literacy Club, a clinical teaching institute for teachers and struggling readers. She has written many articles and chapters in the areas of her research: children's literature, children's response to literature, parent response to children's writing through the Scribliolink (1997) writing strategy, literacy habits of teachers, and improving writing through Read and Retell. She has helped to establish and has taught a collaborative master's degree in reading program, Project READS, with Miami-Dade County Public Schools. As the Chair of International Projects for the Florida Reading Association, she established the Twinning Partnership with GARLAND, the Guyana Association for Reading and Language Development. She currently serves as the archivist of the American Reading Forum, and on

the International Development Grant Committee of the International Reading Association, on the editoral board of the *Florida Reading Quarterly* and the *Journal of Reading Education* of the Organization of Teacher Educators in Reading. She has an Ed.D. from Florida International University in curriculum and instruction with a specialty in reading education.
< finej@fiu.edu >

Amy Seely Flint is an assistant professor in language education at Indiana University in Bloomington where she teaches a number of undergraduate literacy courses for preservice teachers. She collaborates on courses with colleagues in developing a comprehensive literacy program for students. Amy is codirector of the Reading Minor program. Additionally, she is one of two faculty members to facilitate monthly study group sessions with teachers and administrators from four local elementary schools. Amy's research interests include stance, teachers' development of reflection within study groups, and interpretive authority as children read and negotiate text. Amy also serves as a commissioner on the National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction, a three-year study supported by the International Reading Association.
< aflint@indiana.edu >

Susan Florio-Ruane is professor of teacher education at Michigan State University. She has conducted research projects on "Schooling and the Acquisition of Written Literacy," "Autobiographies of Education and Cultural Identity: Preparing Teachers to Support Literacy Learning in Diverse Classrooms," "Reading Culture in Autobiography: The Education of Literacy Teachers," and, with Taffy Raphael, "Re-engaging Low Achieving Readers: Collaborative Research on the Role of Technology in Teachers' Development of Literacy Curriculum." Her paper on what beginning teachers need to know about the social organization of classes and schools won the 1990 Division K Research in Teacher Education Award of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). She served as president of the Council on Anthropology and Education from 1994-96 and associate editor of the *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*. She teaches research methods at the doctoral level as well as masters and undergraduate-level courses in literacy education. She is an external partner to the Schools of Twenty-First Century Initiative for school reform in Detroit, Michigan. Dr. Florio-Ruane has published in numerous books and journals including the *American Educational Research Journal*, the *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, the *Elementary School Journal*, the *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *Research in the Teaching of English, Language Arts*, the *International Journal of Teaching and Teacher Education*, and English Education. She is author of the forthcoming book, *Teacher Education and the Cultural Imagination: Autobiography, Conversation, and Narrative* (Erlbaum, in press).

Gary Galluzzo has been appointed executive vice president of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, beginning June 1, 2000. Dr. Galluzzo is currently dean and professor of the Graduate School of Education at George Mason University. He has also served on the NBPTS board of directors for six years. Dr. Galluzzo was associate dean and professor of the College of Education at the University of Northern Colorado from 1990-1997, associate professor of Teacher Education at Western Kentucky University from 1995-1990, and Coordinator of Educational Research and Evaluation at Glassboro State College in

New Jersey from 1980-1985. He began is career as a social studies high school teacher. He is a member of the board of directors of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and was co-chair of the Colorado Teachers and Special Services Professional Standards Board. Dr. Galluzzo obtained a doctorate in 1983 and a masters degree in Social Science Education in 1975, both from Syracuse University. He holds a BA in Political Science from Utica College. < ggalluzz@nbpts.org >

George P. Gonzalez is an associate professor at Hunter College, School of Education. He holds a Ph.D. in developmental psychology, a masters degree in psychology and bilingual special education. Professor Gonzalez teaches courses in both the graduate and undergraduate programs. He has taught methods courses in developmental reading, language arts, social studies, bilingual special education, curriculum development and Art of Effective Teaching. In addition, he has supervised student teachers and presently serves as the coordinator of the undergraduate education QUEST program at Hunter College. He has worked extensively with students coordinating their fieldwork experience and has developed an excellent working relationship with various schools throughout the districts.
< eogonzal@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu >

James V. Hoffman is professor of language and literacy studies at the University of Texas, Austin. He is codirector of the National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction. He has been an elementary teacher in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and a reading specialist in Zweibruecken, Germany. Hoffman has served as the associate editor of the International Reading Association journal *Reading Research Quarterly*, and has served on the advisory board for that publication and *The Reading Teacher*. Hoffman's publications include *The Recitation Lesson*, *Understanding Reading Instruction*, and *Fundamentals of Elementary and Middle School Classroom Instruction*.
< jhoffman@mail.utexas.edu >

Charles K. Kinzer is an associate professor of education in the Department of Teaching and Learning and a research scientist in the Learning Technology Center at Vanderbilt University, where he teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in language and literacy. His research interests include examining the potentials of technology in the education of preK-8 children as well as preservice and inservice teachers in literacy education programs. He may be reached by mail at 330-GPC, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37203, or by e-mail. < chuck.kinzer@vanderbilt.edu >

Rosary Lalik is an associate professor in the College of Human Resources and Education at Virginia Tech where, since 1982, she has worked extensively with beginning and experienced teachers. Currently she serves as faculty leader for the Post-Baccalaureate Program for the Preparation of Elementary Teachers. In addition she has served as faculty coordinator for master's degree programs in literacy instruction in several sites across the Commonwealth of Virginia. Currently she is working with a group of experienced teachers in Fairfax County, Virginia. From 1988-1994, Dr. Lalik also served as program leader for elementary education. Her teaching has been recognized through several awards. For example, she has received the Wine Award for Outstanding Teaching from Virginia Tech.

Prior to joining a university faculty, Dr. Lalik worked as an elementary classroom teacher, a reading teacher, and a reading clinician. Dr. Lalik has focused her teaching and research on literacy education. Her research interests include teacher learning and the role of home culture in school literacy learning. In 1982, she earned her Ed.D. from Syracuse University where she studied with faculty in the Reading and Language Arts Center. Since then she has presented her research at several national forums including the National Reading Conference and the American Educational Research Association. Her work has been published in numerous journals including *The Reading Teacher*, *The Journal of Educational Research*, *The Elementary School Journal*, the *Journal of the Association for Research on Science Teaching*, and the *Yearbook of the National Reading Conference*. Currently, Dr. Lalik serves on the editorial review board for the *Journal of Literacy Research* and is a member of the Board of Examiners for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). < rlalik@vt.edu >

Rachelle Loven is an associate professor at the University of Sioux Falls, South Dakota. She also serves as a commissioner for the International Reading Association's National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction. < rachelle.loven@thecoo.edu >

Marg Mast is a doctoral student in language and literacy studies at the University of Texas at Austin. Marg is a former classroom teacher and school librarian, and her interests are in the areas of children's literature, reader response, and teacher education.

P. David Pearson holds the John A. Hannah Distinguished Professorship of Education in the College of Education at Michigan State University, where he is a member of the Department of Teacher Education and the Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology, and Special Education. He continues to pursue a line of research related to reading instruction and reading assessment policies and practices at all levels—local, state, and national. His recent work focuses on attempting to validate standards-based approaches to portfolio and performance assessment. < ppearson@msu.edu >

Ann Potts is an assistant professor in the Department of Teaching and Learning at Virginia Tech. There she serves as a faculty leader for Baccalaureate/Post-Baccalaureate Program for the Preparation of Elementary Teachers and as a member of the graduate faculty in literacy studies. She had been active in supporting teacher research for students at Virginia Tech and, in her role as Teacher Research Co-Chair of the Virginia State Reading Association, for teachers across the Commonwealth of Virginia. Currently, she is helping preservice teachers to examine various conceptions of literacy and their pedagogical implications. Dr. Potts completed a teacher preparation program at the Ripon College of Education affiliated to Leeds University in Ripon, England. Upon graduation, she began specializing in primary grade teaching. After coming to the United States, Dr. Potts directed an alternative school for young children within which teachers transformed Piagetian and Vygotskian theory into classroom practice. In 1996, Dr. Potts earned her Ph.D. from Virginia Tech in curriculum and instruction. Before, accepting a position at Virginia Tech, she was an assistant professor in the College of Education at Radford University. Dr. Potts' research focuses on the

development of learning environments for teachers that promote trust and inquiry as the bases for learning about literacy. She has presented her work at state and national forums, including the National Reading Conference and the Virginia State Reading Association. Her research appears in the *Yearbook of the National Research Conference*.
< apotts@vt.edu >

Taffy Raphael is a professor in the Department of Reading and Language Arts at Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan. She received the Outstanding Teacher Educator in Reading Award from the International Reading Association, May 1997. Dr. Raphael's research has focused on innovations in literacy instruction and in teachers' professional development, and has been published in journals such as *Reading Research Quarterly*, *Research in the Teaching of English*, *The Reading Teacher*, and *Language Arts*. She has coauthored and edited several books on research and practice in literacy instruction. She currently serves as president of the National Reading Conference, and as Associate Director of Research for the Center for the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement. < raphael@oakland.edu >

Cathy M. Roller is the Director of Research and Policy at the International Reading Association. She is also codirector of IRA's teacher preparation study, the National Commission on Excellence in Elementary Teacher Preparation for Reading Instruction. Prior to coming to IRA, she was a professor of curriculum and instruction at the University of Iowa. Dr. Roller directed the reading program there for years while taking part in the classroom teaching and tutoring severely disabled readers. She is the author or coauthor of four books, two of them for IRA: *So . . . What's a Tutor to Do?* and *Variability not Disability: Struggling Readers in a Workshop Classroom*. She has also written numerous journal articles, has received many research grants, makes presentations at regional, national, and international, and professional meetings, and reviews and edits professional journals.
< croller@reading.org >

Misty Sailors is a doctoral student in language and literacy studies at the University of Texas at Austin. Misty is a former classroom teacher, and her primary research interest is in the area of teacher education. < MSailors@mail.utexas.edu >

Alene L. Smith is an associate professor and chairperson of the Department of Curriculum and Teaching at Hunter College of the City University of New York. Dr. Smith holds a doctorate in education from Columbia University Teachers College. She teaches courses in developmental reading, social studies, and children's literature both on the undergraduate and graduate levels. Dr. Smith has presented workshops at city, state, and national conferences and has done consulting in the area of literature/reading. Multicultural literature is one of her areas of expertise. She is the author of several articles about education and literature.
< alsmith@shiva.hunter.cuny.edu >

Dorothy S. Strickland is the State of New Jersey Professor of Reading at Rutgers University. She was formerly the Arthur I. Gates Professor of Education at Teachers College of Columbia University. A former classroom teacher, reading consultant, and learning disabilities specialist, she is a past president of the International Reading Association and of

the IRA Reading Hall of Fame. She received IRA's Outstanding Teacher Educator of Reading Award and the National Council of Teachers of English Award as Outstanding Educator in the Language Arts and the NCTE Rewey Belle Inglis Award as Outstanding Woman in the Teaching of English. She has numerous publications in the field of reading/language arts. Her latest book is *Teaching Phonics Today*.
< strickla@rci.rutgers.edu >

Barbara M. Taylor holds the Guy Bond Chair in Reading in the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Minnesota where she is a member of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction. She is also the principal investigator of a CIERA project investigating school change in schools that aspire to beat the odds in primary grade reading achievement. She continues to conduct research on early reading intervention.
< bmtaylor@tc.umn.edu >

Sheila W. Valencia is Professor of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Washington, Seattle, where she conducts research on literacy assessment and the professional development of teachers. Her work on assessment has appeared in *The Reading Teacher*, *Reading Research Quarterly*, *Journal of Literacy Research*, and several edited volumes. Her most recent book, *Literacy Portfolios in Action*, is the result of a 7-year collaboration with teachers to design classroom assessment tools. Most recently, Dr. Valencia has been involved in a longitudinal study of preservice teachers' transition into full-time teaching. With her colleague, Dr. Pam Grossman, she is studying the pedagogical tools teachers develop in their teacher education programs and how they modify and use those tools during their early years of teaching. < valencia@u.washington.edu >

Carmelita KimberWilliams is a professor in the School of Education and director of the Center for America Reads/Reading Partners' Clinic at Norfolk State University in Virginia. She has coauthored texts for college developmental reading programs entitled *Fundamental Communication Skills* and *Advanced Communication Skills*. She is also a contributing author featured in *College Reading and the New Majority*. Her contributions to the profession include service as a classroom teacher, reading specialist, university professor, department chair of the NSU Reading Department, senior program associate in reading for the Institute for Services to Education, and the university representative for the Virginia Beach City Public Schools' Early Intervention Team and Research Action Team for Language Arts. Williams is president-elect of the International Reading Association and will serve as president from May of 2000-2001. < cwilliams@vger.nsu.edu >